REMARKS

Claims 25 and 27 have been amended. Claims 3, 8, 10, 11, 15, 26 and 28 have been canceled. Claim 29 has been newly added. Claims 25, 27 and 29 are now pending in this application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims and any other claims in this and other applications.

Claims 3, 8-11, 15 and 25-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kume (U.S. Patent No. 6,203,433) in view of Collins (U.S. Patent No. 5,963,951). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3, 8-11, 15, 26 and 28 have been canceled and thus, the rejection is now moot in regards to those claims. Claim 25 recites, *inter alia*, a game task execution management method comprising the steps of "registering on a database of the server information . . . including plural items which the players want to register on the server, said items including a current progress status of the game being executed on each of the terminals; . . . [and] searching one or ones matching to the request among the terminals currently on the network of the players registered on the database." Claim 25 further recites "sending to the terminal all the request control-information necessary for starting the game program from an intervene stage of the game currently being played on the terminal or terminals selected as matching to the request, so that all of the terminals selected as the team have the common control information for performing said common task on the game executing on the respective terminals." Claim 27 recites similar limitations.

The cited reference, Kume, relates to a network game system which carries out indoor games such as Shogi, Igo, Chess, Othello game, Mah-jong, and Fighting-type television games. Based on the characteristics of these games, the games have to be started each time from the beginning of the game, and cannot be joined and started

5

from an intervening stage of a game currently being played. Thus, Kume cannot disclose, teach or suggest a game method that can "[register] on a database of the server information . . . including plural items which the players want to register on the server, said items including a current progress status of the game being executed on each of the terminals," much less a game method that can "[send] to the terminal all the request control-information necessary for starting the game program from an intervene stage of the game currently being played on the terminal or terminals selected as matching to the request," as recited in claim 25.

The Office Action seeks to overcome the deficiencies of Kume by combining Collins. However, the cited reference, Collins, also fails to refer to such limitations. Collins relates to a computerized on-line dating service for searching and matching people by a percentage match parameter value. (See Abstract). The Office Action asserts that Collins refers to allowing the players of a team to execute a common task of the game on the respective terminals in corporation with each other while connected to the server via network. (Office Action at 3-4). However, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

To the contrary, Collins refers to accessing a database from a terminal and searching the information of the database to find out a matching subscriber using search criteria. Moreover, in Collins, a user operates the terminal only until they find a matching subscriber using the search criteria. Then, after finding a matching subscriber, the user communicates with the matched subscriber using a separate method such as by telephone or letter, not through the terminal itself. Thus, Collins does not teach or suggest a game method that can "[register] on a database of the server information . . . including plural items which the players want to register on the server, said items including a current progress status of the game being executed on each of the terminals," and then "[send] to the terminal all the request control-information

6

necessary for starting the game program from an intervene stage of the game currently being played on the terminal or terminals selected as matching to the request."

Therefore, Kume and Collins, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of claims 25 and 27. It would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the cited references to achieve the claimed invention.

In addition, newly added claim 29 recites similar limitations as described above. Consequently, for at least the reasons set forth above, Kume and Collins do not disclose, teach or suggest all limitations of the claim 29 invention. Similarly, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the cited references to achieve the invention of claim 29.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: February 24, 2006   Respectfully submitted,

                                            By_____
                                            Thomas J. D'Amico
                                                Registration No.: 28,371
                                            DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
                                                OSHINSKY LLP
                                            2101 L Street NW
                                            Washington, DC 20037-1526
                                            (202) 785-9700
                                            Attorneys for Applicant